

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Komori (US 6,782,215).

Claims 2-5, 11-14, 16-19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori in view of Kisu, et al. (US 5,420,671).

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori in view of Kisu, et al. and further in view of Ito (US 6,668,143).

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori in view of Kisu, et al. and further in view of Takahashi (US 4,026,648).

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori in view of Kisu, et al. and further in view of Furuya (US 6,118,952).

Claims 7-10, 22-24, 26, and 27 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants amend independent claim 1 by incorporating the features of dependent claims 2 and 3 and amend independent claim 11 by incorporating the features of dependent claims 12 and 13. In addition, Applicants cancel dependent claims 2, 3, 12, and 13, without prejudice or disclaimer. Furthermore, Applicants amend dependent claims 4 and 14 to be consistent with the changes made in their respective independent claims. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-11, 14-27 are currently pending for consideration.

**All Claims are Allowable**

Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Komori (US, 6,782,215), and claims 2-5, 11-14, 16-19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori in view of Kisu et al. (US, 5,420,671), claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori in view of Kisu et al., and further in view of Ito (US, 6,668,143), claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori in view of Kisu et al., and further in view of Takahashi (US, 4,026,648), and claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Komori in view of Kisu et al., and further in view of Furuya (US, 6,118,952). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended recites a charging device including, in part, “a power source adapted to supply the charging member with an electric power showing a voltage waveform obtained by superimposing an AC voltage on a DC voltage” and “a power source control section adapted to control the electric current of the AC component supplied to the charging member by the power source on the basis of the electric current gauged by the ammeter.” Similarly, independent claim 11, as amended recites an image forming apparatus including, in part, “a power source adapted to supply an electric power showing a voltage waveform obtained by superimposing an AC voltage on a DC voltage” and “a power source control section that controls the electric current of the AC component supplied to the charging member by the power source on the basis of the electric current gauged by the ammeter.”

Applicants respectfully submit that at least these features of amended independent claims 1 and

11 are neither taught nor suggested by Komori, Kisu et al., Ito, Takahashi, and Furuuya, whether taken singly or combined.

In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, as depicted in FIG 2 and as discussed at col. 3, lines 5-68, Komori teaches an electrophotographic printer including a charging power supply 3 which supplies an electric charge (i.e. charge current  $I_{mc}$ ) to the charging roller 1. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Komori is completely silent as to the charging power supply 3 adapted to supply "an electric power showing a voltage waveform obtained by superimposing an AC voltage on a DC voltage to the charging member." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Komori fails to anticipate at least the features recited in the amended independent claims 1 and 11.

In addition, the Office Action at page 4, lines 18-19 asserts that Kisu et al. teaches the feature of "where the electric current of the AC component supplied is controlled based on an electric current sensed (col. 11, lines 26-31). Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants respectfully submit that Kisu et al. teaches at col. 6, lines 51-60, col. 8, lines 40-45, col. 10, lines 25-44, that a power source E of Kisu et al. includes a constant current AC source E-1 which supplies a constant current (i.e., 750 micro-amperes) and a combination of AC current detector 20 and a sine oscillator circuit 21 to provide a constant current control so that only the constant voltage/current can be supplied to the charging roller 4. However, none of these components discussed by Kisu et al. provide the power source adapted to vary the AC component and supply such varying AC current to the charging member (i.e., charging roller 4). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Komori and Kisu et al. taken singly or in combination, fails to teach or suggest every element recited by the amended independent claims 1 and 11, hence

dependent claims 4-10 and 14-27. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that Kisu et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Komori. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Kisu et al., Ito, Takahashi, and Furuya, whether taken singly or combined, fails to cure the deficiencies of Komori.

Accordingly, in light of the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of amended independent claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1 and 11 are allowable. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 4-10 and 14-27 are allowable at least because of their respective dependencies from allowable claims 1 and 11 and for the additional features that they recite.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: Mary Jane Boswell  
Mary Jane Boswell  
Reg. No. 33,652

Date: August 26, 2005

**Customer No. 009629**

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel.: (202) 739-3000

MJB/SO/fdb